

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
 Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
 Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

DEC 23 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 19 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims Claims 1 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 stand rejected as anticipated.

Claims 1 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120864, hereinafter referred to as Wu. With respect to Claims 1, 4 and 7, the rejection stated, in part:

... Wu et al. discloses a method, program and apparatus for managing identification in a data communications network comprising a user-controlled secure storage device, enrolling user of the user controlled secure storage device with an authority network site, providing information requested, storing the data, enabling the user-controlled secure storage device to release user data and use the user data at a service provider network site to obtain a service. (See page 4, Sections 0040-042)

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 1, 4 and 7. Applicants respectfully note that it is not sufficient that Wu teach some authority network site, providing information requests, storing, etc. Rather, the MPEP requires:

"A Claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the Claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." . . . . "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." (Emphasis Added.)

MPEP § 2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005)

The rejection paraphrases Applicants' claim language but does not identify any specific features in the reference in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. The rejection has not identified "a user-controlled secure storage device," that is received, in which user data is stored, and

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
 HODGSON, LLP.  
 Gordon Weil Office Plaza  
 1900 Gardner Street, Suite 220  
 Monterey, CA 93940  
 (831) 654-0888  
 Fax (831) 654-0888

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amtd. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

#### AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

which is enabled to release user data. The cited paragraphs simply describes a transaction between a user, a partner site, and an information server using HTTP commands issued by the partner site. The HTTP command sent by the partner site is not a user-controlled secure storage device used as recited in Claim 1. The User interface control is not a user-controlled secure storage device used as recited in Claim 1.

It is not sufficient that the reference provide an overview of a transaction in the cited paragraphs, but rather the rejection must site a user-controlled secure storage device that is used as recited in the claims. The rejection has not provided sufficient specificity that it is even possible to determine what was considered to be the various elements recited in Claim 1. The cited paragraphs do not teach anything concerning such a device and so fail to anticipate Claims 1, 4 and 7 according to the above criteria from the MPEP. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 4 is a program storage device corresponding to method Claim 1 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 1. Claim 7 is a means-plus-function Claim corresponding to method Claim 1 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 1. Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference for Claims 4 and 7. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 4 and 7.

With respect to Claims 2, 5 and 8, the rejection stated, in part:

... Wu et al. discloses a method, program and apparatus for managing identification in a data communications network comprising receiving a user-controlled secure storage device, enrolling user of the user-controlled secure storage device with authority network site, providing information requested, receiving the data in two

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP.  
Gardner West Office Plaza  
1900 Gardon Road, Suite 220  
Maitland, CA 93940  
(801) 655-0550  
Fax (801) 655-0888

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

portion comprising a cryptogram computed based on the second portion, storing the data, enabling the user-controlled secure storage device to release user data, and using the user data at a service provider network site to obtain a service. (See page 4, Sections 0044-0045)

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 2. Again, the rejection paraphrases Applicants' claim language but does not identify any specific features in the reference in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. As in Claim 1, Claim 2 recites "a user-controlled secure storage device," that is received, in which user data is stored, and which is enabled to release user data. The rejection of Claim 1 cited paragraphs 40 to 42 as teaching exactly this element, but the rejection of Claim 2 relies upon paragraphs 44 and 45. The differences in the rejection demonstrates that the reference is being interpreted differently, even though the claims include similar elements.

Paragraphs 44 and 45 do describe establishment of a user account and permitting the user to establish different named profiles and aliases for information subsets stored in the user accounts. Accordingly, these paragraphs fail to teach anything concerning a user controlled secure storage device.

In addition, the reference stated "The identifier, potentially further based on an encrypted key token . . ." There is no other mention of encryption in these paragraphs. This teaches nothing about two portions of user data where one of the portions is a cryptogram. Consequently, the rejection failed to cite teachings at the same level of detail not only of the operations associated with the secure storage device, but also of the specific relationship of the user data. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 2.

Claim 5 is a program storage device corresponding to method Claim 2 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 2. Claim 8 is a means-plus-

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, L.L.P.  
Gardner West Office Plaza  
1900 Gardner Road, Suite 730  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 655-0888  
Fax (831) 655-0738

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

function Claim corresponding to method Claim 2 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 2. Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 2 are incorporated herein by reference for Claims 5 and 8. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 5 and 8.

With respect to Claims 3, 6 and 9, the rejection stated, in part:

. . . Wu et al. discloses a method, program and apparatus for managing identification in a data communications network presenting an identity credential request and data to be stored to a federated identity server via a client host, receiving an identity credential in response to randomized ID and receiving a logon credential in response to the service request (See pages 5-6, Section 0047 and Sections 0053-00547)

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 3. Again, based upon the above quotation from the MPEP, Applicants respectfully note that the rejection fails to consider explicit Claim limitations and so fails to meet the criterion required for by the MPEP for an anticipation rejection.

Again, the rejection itself demonstrates that Wu fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Claim 3 does not recite the rejected "receiving an identity credential in response to randomized ID" but rather,

receiving an identity credential in response to said identity credential request, said identity credential comprising a randomized ID and an identification authority ID, said federated identity server capable of verifying the truthfulness, accuracy and completeness of said data to be stored

The rejection has not even alleged that Wu teaches this element but rather a totally different operation. This alone

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP.  
Garden Way Office Tower  
1000 Cedars Road, Suite 720  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 655-0888  
Fax (831) 655-0888

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
is sufficient to overcome the anticipation rejection of  
Claim 3.

Further, the cited sections of Wu do not include the word "randomized" and do not include any description of "verifying the truthfulness, accuracy and completeness of said data to be stored." Thus, Wu fails to satisfy the requirements of the MPEP.

Finally, the rejection is incomplete, the rejection does not even allege that Wu teaches:

presenting a service request and said identity credential to a service portal, said service portal configured to issue an authentication request to said federated identity server

Thus, the anticipation rejection of Claim 3 is defective for multiple reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 3.

Claim 6 is a program storage device corresponding to method Claim 3 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 3. Claim 9 is a means-plus-function Claim corresponding to method Claim 3 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 3. Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 3 are incorporated herein by reference for Claims 6 and 9. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 6 and 9.

With respect to Claims 10, 13 and 16, the rejection stated, in part:

. . . Wu et al. discloses a method for protecting privacy on a data communications network, receiving a user identifier and specific user data associated with the user identifier, the specific user data comprising data about a network user, creating user data based on specific user data, and returning the user identifier and the generalized user data. (See page 5, Section 0047)

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP.  
Garden West Office Plaza  
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220  
Mountain, CA 93340  
(831) 655-0810  
Fax (831) 655-0788

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

#### AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 10. Again, based upon the above quotation from the MPEP, Applicants respectfully note that paraphrasing Applicants' Claim 10 and citing generally to a portion of Wu. It is impossible from this rejection to determine what is considered in Wu to teach exactly the method of Claim 10.

Wu taught "The required independent receipt of both the partner and user-identifiers . . ." Thus, according to paragraph 0047, the information server system does not receive "a user identifier and specific user data" as recited in Claim 10, but instead a user identifier and a partner identifier. Therefore, the rejection fails to meet the requirements of the MPEP as quoted above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 10.

Claim 13 is a program storage device corresponding to method Claim 10 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 10. Claim 16 is a means-plus-function Claim corresponding to method Claim 10 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 10. Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 10 are incorporated herein by reference for Claims 13 and 16. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 13 and 16.

With respect to Claims 12, 15, and 18, the rejection stated, in part:

... Wu et al. discloses a method for protecting privacy on a data communications network, storing user logon information for at least one service provider on a user-controlled secure device, the least one service provider server comprising at least one network server providing a service to a user, and logging on the device, and logging on providing access to the least one service provider server.. (See pages 7-8, Sections 0065-0068)

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 12. Again, the rejection paraphrases Applicants' Claim 12. It is impossible from this rejection to determine what is considered in Wu to teach exactly the method of Claim 12.

In addition, the rejection has not identified what in Wu is considered to be "a user-controlled secure storage device." Since the browser is on the only user controlled device, Wu taught away from

storing user logon information for at least one service provider server on a user-controlled secure device

as recited in Claim 12 because a browser is not a user-controlled secure device that stores logon information. Accordingly, the cited portions of Wu fail to satisfy the criterion from the MPEP as quoted above with respect to Claim 12. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 12.

Claim 15 is a program storage device corresponding to method Claim 12 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 12. Claim 18 is a means-plus-function Claim corresponding to method Claim 12 and thus includes substantially the same distinctive feature as Claim 12. Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 12 are incorporated herein by reference for Claims 15 and 18. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 15 and 18.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ming-Chuan Wu et al., "Encoded Bitmap Indexing for Data Warehouses," hereinafter referred to as Wu. The rejection stated in part:

. . . a data structure stored in the memory, the data structure including a bit-mapped in the field determined by whether the user is a member of a group associated with

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP,  
Garden West Office Plaza  
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220  
Maitland, CA 93440  
(831) 655-0180  
Fax (831) 655-0182

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

the bit, the mapping for between bits in the field and membership in a group maintained by an aggregation authority. (See Abstract, page 220, and Section 2.1)

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 19. Applicant expressly traversed this rejection and the traverse was not even acknowledged in the final office action. Accordingly, the final office action is incomplete and should be withdrawn. Moreover, since the comments were not rebutted, it is an admission that Applicants' remarks were correct and so this claim should have been allowed.

Again, based upon the above quotation from the MPEP, the requirement for a reference is not that the reference teach some general abstract concept related to the invention, but rather the reference **must show** "The identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

Wu describes generally the concept of using "simple bitmap indexing and the application domain for which it is ideally suited." The application domain is defined by abstract mathematical concepts and is not related by Wu to "membership in a group." Further, the rejection cited no teaching of "the mapping for between bits in said field and membership in a group maintained by an aggregation authority," but simply paraphrased the claim language. Accordingly, the rejection failed to meet the criteria required by the MPEP for an anticipation rejection. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 19.

//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//

GUNNISON, MCKAY &  
HODGSON, LLP.  
Garden Way Office Plaza  
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 655-0880  
Fax (831) 655-0888

Appl. No. 10/040,293  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of October 31, 2005

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

Claims 1 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 remain in the application. Claims 11, 14 and 17 were previously cancelled. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899

*Rivkah Young*  
Rivkah Young

December 23, 2005  
Date of Signature